

NEWHOUSE & ASSOCIATES

Twin Oaks Office Plaza
477 Ninth Avenue, Suite 112
San Mateo, California 94402-1854
<http://www.attycubed.com>

David E. Newhouse, Esq.
Patent Reg. No. 24,911
CA State Bar No. 54,217

Tel. No.: (650) 348-8652
Fax. No. (650) 348-8655
e-mail: den@attycubed.com

Ray K. Shahani, Esq.
Patent Reg. No. 37,554
CA State Bar No. 160,814

Tel. No.: (650) 348-1444
Fax. No. (650) 348-8655
e-mail: rks@attycubed.com

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
LAST)
)
)
Serial No.: 10/758,705)
)
Filing Date: January 14, 2004)
)
Attorney Docket No.: DEN-1693.19)
)
Title: TRAVELING COVER BENCH)
SYSTEM WITH HYDRAULIC)
FLUID ACTUATOR)
_____)

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO
PAPER MAILED 07/12/2004**

Date Mailed: November 5, 2004

Examiner: FETSUGA, Robert M.

Group Art Unit: 3751

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO PAPER MAILED 07/12/2004

Dear Sir,

Applicant is in receipt of Paper mailed 07/12/2004. Thank you for your continued expedient examination of the present Application.

///

11/09/2004 KBETENA1 00000022 503056 10758705
01 FC:2251 55.00 DA

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO PAPER MAILED 07/12/2004

Filing Date: January 14, 2004
Date of Mailing: November 5, 2004

Page 1 of 24

Title: TRAVELING COVER BENCH SYSTEM WITH
HYDRAULIC FLUID ACTUATOR

Serial No.: 10/758,705
Attorney Docket No.: DEN-1693.19

STATEMENT OF CLAIMS STATUS

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claims 1-19 are rejected .

///

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

1. Examiner States: "Originally filed claims 13, 13-18 must be renumbered as claims 13, 14-19, respectively, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126."

Drawings

2. Examiner States: "The drawings are objected to because reference numeral "101" apparently should be deleted from Figs. 1A and 1B, reference numeral "302" (upper) apparently should be - 304- (pg. 13 ln. 22) in Figs. 1A and 1E, reference numeral "106" apparently should be -206- (pg. 14 in. 7) in Fig. 3, reference characters "AA", "BE", "CC" and "DD" (pg. 14 lns. 9, 16, 18 and 25) are missing, reference character "EE" (pg. 15 ln. 6) is missing, and reference numerals "506" and "420" (pg. 17 lns. 8 and 24) are missing.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "actuator" set forth in claims 3 and 4, subject matter set forth in claims 15 and 16, "central shaft" set forth in claim 17, and "method" set forth in claim 19, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in response to this office action. Any proposal by applicant for amendment of the drawings to cure defects must consist of two parts:

- a) A separate letter to the draftsman in accordance with MPEP 608.02(r); and
- b) A print or pen-and-ink sketch showing changes in red ink in accordance with MPEP 608.02 (v).

IMPORTANT NOTE: The filing of new formal drawings to correct the noted defect may be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner, but the print or pen-and-ink sketch with

proposed corrections shown in red ink is required in response to this Office action, and may not be deferred.”

Disclosure

3. Examiner States: “The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 12, lines 8 and 17, reference numeral “112” denotes different elements; page 14, line 7, and page 16, line 6, reference numeral “356” denotes different elements; page 15, line 10, “314” apparently should be -318-; and page 17, line 23, “106” apparently should be -206-. Appropriate correction is required.”

Specification

4. Examiner States: “The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d) (1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Proper antecedent basis for the “coupled directly” limitation set forth in claim 15, “gear assembly” set forth in claim 16, “mechanical linkage” set forth in claims 17 and 19, and “method” steps set forth in claim 19, could not be found in the specification. Applicant is reminded claim terminology in mechanical cases should appear in the descriptive portion of the specification by reference to the drawing(s).”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Examiner States: “Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 1 recites “rotating the wheels thereby causing the cover drum enclosure to travel”. Implementation of this subject matter is neither taught by the instant disclosure nor evident to the examiner. Page 14, lines 7-20, disclose wheels 310,312 as rotating in the same direction. This does not appear possible given

the illustration in Fig. 3. Claims 7, 17 and 19 include a similar recitation.”

6. Examiner States: “Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 1 recites “an actuator for rotating the wheels”. The only actuator eluded to in the specification is the “master hydraulic fluid valve/rotor cap/diverter valve assembly 420 which serves to distribute actuation...” (pg. 17 ln. 24). Implementation of this subject matter is neither taught by the instant disclosure nor evident to the examiner. Claims 8, 9, 17 and 19 include a similar recitation.”
7. Examiner States: “Claims 6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 6 recites “the actuator is also connected to the central drive shaft...”. Implementation of this subject matter is neither taught by the instant disclosure nor evident to the examiner. Claim 9 includes a similar recitation.”
8. Examiner States: “Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. The claim recites “the cylinder piston rod is coupled directly to the drive cable.” Implementation of this subject matter is neither taught by the instant disclosure nor evident to the examiner.”
9. Examiner States: “Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. The claim recites “the cylinder piston rod is coupled to the drive cable via gear assembly.” Implementation of this subject matter is neither taught by the instant disclosure nor evident to the examiner.”
10. Examiner States: “Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. The claim is unclear as to whether the “central drive shaft” is intended to be part of the claimed combination since structure of the “traveling drum enclosure” is defined as being connected thereto (ln. 2), but no positive structural antecedent basis therefor has been defined.”

///

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. Examiner States: "Claims 1-6 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vorbach et al. The Vorbach et al. (Vorbach) reference (Fig. 8) discloses a traveling drum enclosure comprising: a drum enclosure 45 including a plurality of wheels 47; an actuator 15; a drive cable 35; a central drive shaft (connected to 38); a remote power pack (paragraph 27, lines 13-19), as claimed. Re claims 2 and 3, note paragraph 27, lines 11-13."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. Examiner States: "Claims 1-6 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vorbach and Varnado. Although the Vorbach traveling drum enclosure may not include a drum enclosure, as disclosed, attention is directed to the Varnado reference which discloses an analogous traveling drum enclosure which further includes a drum enclosure 12. Therefore, in consideration of Varnado, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate a drum enclosure with the Vorbach traveling drum enclosure in order to facilitate cleaning a cover."
13. Examiner States: "Claims 1—19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vorbach alone, or taken with Varnado as applied to claims 1, 17 and 19 above, and further in view of Janetzko et al. Although the Vorbach hydraulic fluid actuator may not include a cylinder/rod, as claimed, attention is directed to the Janetzko et al. (Janetzko) reference which discloses an analogous hydraulic fluid actuator which further includes a cylinder/rod 3,4. Therefore, in consideration of Janetzko, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to associate a cylinder/rod with the Vorbach hydraulic fluid actuator in order to utilize a common hydraulic fluid actuator."

14. Examiner States: "Applicant is referred to MPEP 714.02 and 608.01(o) in responding to this Office action."

///